

Is the intersection of two finitely generated subalgebras of a polynomial ring also finitely generated?

Pinaki Mondal
Weizmann Institute of Science
pinaki@math.toronto.edu

January 15, 2013

Abstract

Let k be a field and R be the polynomial ring in n variables over k . Given two finitely generated k -subalgebras of R , we ask “is their intersection also always finitely generated?” For $\text{characteristic}(k) = 0$, we construct counter-examples for $n = 3$ based on *non-algebraic* analytic normal compactifications of $\mathbb{C}^2$ constructed in [Mon13] (counter-examples were previously constructed in [Bay02] for $n \geq 32$). Since the answer in the case $n = 1$ is true, this leaves the question tantalizingly open for $n = 2$.

1 Introduction

Let k be a field and $R := k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are indeterminates. Let R_1, R_2 be finitely generated k -subalgebras of R .

Question 1.1. Is $R_1 \cap R_2$ finitely generated as an algebra over k ?

For $n = 1$ the answer to Question 1.1 is positive, since any subalgebra A of $k[x]$ is finitely generated (indeed, either $A = k$ or $k[x]$ is integral over A and in the latter case A is a finitely generated k -algebra by a well known property of Noetherian rings [AM69, Proposition 7.8]). In fact it was shown in [Gal57] that A is generated over k by at most $d + 1$ elements, where d is the smallest degree of a non-constant polynomial in A . On the other hand, for $n \geq 2$, even though it is easy to construct non-finitely generated k -subalgebras of $k[x, y]$, it is a priori not obvious if these can appear as intersections of two finitely generated sub-algebras. Indeed, using a result of [Sch00] we show that the answer to Question 1.1 for $n = 2$ is *affirmative* if R_1 and R_2 are integrally closed and the field of fractions of each R_i is $k(x_1, x_2)$ (Theorem 3.1). We conjecture that the answer is in fact affirmative for $n = 2$.

Finite generation of subalgebras of polynomial algebras has been well studied, see e.g. [Nag66], [Eak72], [GH85], [DO08] and references therein. One of the classical motivations for these studies has been Hilbert’s 14th problem. Indeed, in [Bay02] counter-examples to Question 1.1 have been constructed for $n \geq 32$ using Nagata’s counterexamples to Hilbert’s 14th problem. Our motivation to study this question however comes from *projective completions* of affine varieties via *degree-like functions*. More precisely, if A is a k -algebra, then $\delta : A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is called a *degree-like function* if it satisfies the following ‘degree-like’ properties:

P1. $\delta(f + g) \leq \max\{\delta(f), \delta(g)\}$, and

P2. $\delta(fg) \leq \delta(f) + \delta(g)$.

Given δ as above, consider the graded ring

$$A^\delta := \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \{f \in A : \delta(f) \leq d\} \cong \sum_{d \geq 0} \{f \in A : \delta(f) \leq d\} t^d \quad (1)$$

where t is an indeterminate. If X is an affine variety over k , then it turns out that for a ‘reasonable’ degree-like function δ on the coordinate ring $k[X]$ of X , $\bar{X}^\delta := \text{Proj } k[X]^\delta$ is a *projective completion* of X (i.e. $\bar{X}^\delta$ is a projective variety that contains X as a dense open subset) (see [Mon10a, Proposition 2.5], [Mon10b, Proposition 1.1.2]). One of the ‘reasonable’ properties of δ alluded to in the preceding sentence is that $k[X]^\delta$ should be finitely generated over k . Since a ‘fundamental’ operation for producing new degree-like functions out of old ones is to take the *maximum* (see e.g. [Mon10a, Theorem 4.1]), it is natural to ask

*Question 1.1**. If $k[X]^{\delta_1}$ and $k[X]^{\delta_2}$ are finitely generated algebras over k , is it true that $k[X]^\delta$ is also finitely generated over k , where $\delta := \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$?

In the case that X is the affine space k^n , Question 1.1* reduces to Question 1.1 via the following observations:

Observation 1. In this case $k[X]^\delta$ is isomorphic to a subalgebra of polynomial rings in $n + 1$ variables (follows from the second expression in (1)), and

Observation 2. If $\delta = \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, then $k[X]^\delta = k[X]^{\delta_1} \cap k[X]^{\delta_2}$ (as subalgebras of $k[X][t]$, where t is as in (1)).

Indeed, our counter-examples (in dimension 3) of Question 1.1 come from considerations of completions of $\mathbb{C}^2$. More precisely, for $k := \mathbb{C}$ and $X := \mathbb{C}^2$, we give a recipe to construct δ_1 and δ_2 on $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ which give a counter-example to Question 1.1*. In fact, the counter-examples stem from the fact that the δ ’s from our construction correspond to *non-algebraic* normal analytic compactifications of $\mathbb{C}^2$ constructed in [Mon13].

Remark 1.2. In the same way as in our examples, from *every* non-algebraic normal analytic compactification of $\mathbb{C}^2$ it is possible to construct collections of finitely generated $\mathbb{C}$ -subalgebras of $\mathbb{C}[x, y, t]$ such that their intersections are not finitely generated over $\mathbb{C}$.

Remark 1.3. The $\mathbb{C}$ -subalgebras R_1 and R_2 of $\mathbb{C}[x, y, t]$ from our counter-examples are in particular *graded* $\mathbb{C}$ -algebras (the grading being given by exponents of t) which are integrally closed and in all cases, each of R_1 , R_2 and $R_1 \cap R_2$ has field of fraction $\mathbb{C}(x, y, t)$. Theorem 3.1 shows that this sort of counter-example (to Question 1.1) can not occur for $n = 2$.

I would like to thank Professor Pierre Milman - the mathematics of this article was worked out while I was his postdoc at University of Toronto. The article has been written up during the stay at the Weizmann Institute as an Azrieli Fellow. I am grateful to the Azrieli Foundation for the award of an Azrieli Fellowship.

2 Main example(s)

We describe one example in detail. See Remark 2.7 for the general construction. Let $\tilde{R} := \mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, y, t]$ and $y_1 := y - x^5 - x^{-2}$, $y_2 := y + x^5 - x^{-2} \in S$. For both i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, define

$$\tilde{R}_i := \sum_{d \geq 0} \tilde{R}_{i,d} t^d, \quad \text{where} \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{R}_{i,d} := \mathbb{C}\langle x^\alpha y_i^\beta : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \alpha - 3\beta \leq d \rangle \quad (3)$$

(the $\langle x^\alpha y_i^\beta \rangle$ in (3) denotes the vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ spanned by all the $x^\alpha y_i^\beta$). Let $R := \mathbb{C}[x, y, t]$ and $R_i := R \cap \tilde{R}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 2$.

Theorem 2.1. *R_1 and R_2 are finitely generated $\mathbb{C}$ -algebras, but $R_1 \cap R_2$ is not finitely generated over $\mathbb{C}$.*

Remark 2.2. Note that each $R_i \cong \mathbb{C}[x, y]^{\delta_i}$, where δ_i is the (restriction to $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$) of the weighted degree on $\mathbb{C}(x, y) = \mathbb{C}(x, y_i)$ corresponding to weights 1 for x and -3 for y_i .

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Theorem 2.1 follows from combining Remark 2.2 and Observation 2 of Section 1 with Corollary 2.5 and Lemma 2.6 below. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Let ω be the weighted degree on $S := \mathbb{C}[x, y, z_1, z_2]$ which gives weights 1, 5, -2 , -1 to respectively x, y, z_1, z_2 . Let π_1 (resp. π_2) : $S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ be the $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra homomorphism which is identity on $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ and maps $z_1 \mapsto y - x^5$ and $z_2 \mapsto x^2(y - x^5) - 1$ (resp. $z_1 \mapsto y + x^5$ and $z_2 \mapsto x^2(y + x^5) - 1$). For each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, let δ_i be the degree-like function on $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ from Remark 2.2 and J_i be the ideal in S generated by weighted homogeneous (with respect to ω) polynomials $F \in S$ such that $\omega(F) > \delta_i(\pi_i(F))$. Then J_1 (resp. J_2) is generated by $y - x^5$ and $x^2 z_1 - 1$ (resp. $y + x^5$ and $x^2 z_1 - 1$).*

Proof. Fix an i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$. At first note that $\omega(F) \geq \delta_i(\pi_i(F))$ for all $F \in S$. Since both ω and δ_i satisfies Property P2 with exact equality, it follows that J_i is a prime ideal of S . Let $\tilde{J}_i$ be the ideal of S generated by $y - x^5$ and $x^2 z_1 - 1$ if $i = 1$, or the ideal generated by $y + x^5$ and $x^2 z_1 - 1$ if $i = 2$. Note that $\tilde{J}_i \subseteq J_i$. We have to show that $\tilde{J}_i = J_i$. Note that

$$S/\tilde{J}_i \cong \mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, z_2] \quad (4)$$

via a graded ring isomorphism, where the grading on both rings is induced by ω . Since $J_i/\tilde{J}_i$ is a prime homogeneous ideal of $S/\tilde{J}_i$, it follows that if $J_i \supsetneq \tilde{J}_i$, then J_i contains an element of the form $xz_2 - \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. But the definitions of δ_i and J_i show that this is impossible and therefore, $J_i = \tilde{J}_i$, as required. $\square$

Corollary 2.4. *Let the notations be as in Lemma 2.3. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, and each $f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $F \in S$ such that $\pi_i(F) = f$ and $\omega(F) = \delta_i(f)$.*

Proof. We prove the claim for $i = 1$, since the statement for $i = 2$ follows in exactly the same way. Fix $f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y] \setminus \{0\}$ and $F \in S$ such that $\pi_1(F) = f$. It suffices to show that if $\omega(F) > \delta_1(f)$, then there exists $F' \in S$ such that $\pi_1(F') = f$ and $\omega(F') < \omega(F)$. So assume $\omega(F) > \delta_1(f)$. Let H be the leading weighted homogeneous form (with respect to ω) of F . Then $H \in J_1$, where J_1 is as in Lemma 2.3. Lemma 2.3 then implies that $H = H_1(y - x^5) + H_2(x^2 z_1 - 1)$ for some $H_1, H_2 \in S$. Setting $F' := (F - H) + H_1 z_1 + H_2 z_2$ shows that $\pi_1(F') = \pi_1(F)$ and $\omega(F') < \omega(F)$, as required. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^{\delta_i}$ is a finitely generated $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra for each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$.

Proof. Fix i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Let t be an indeterminate and $\tilde{S}_i$ be the $\mathbb{C}$ -subalgebra of $S[t]$ generated by all monomials $x^k y^l z_1^{m_1} z_2^{m_2} t^d$ such that $\omega(x^k y^l z_1^{m_1} z_2^{m_2}) \leq d$, and let $\tilde{\pi}_i : \tilde{S}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y]^{\delta_i}$ be the graded $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra morphism which maps

$$x^k y^l z_1^{m_1} z_2^{m_2} t^d \mapsto \pi_i(x^k y^l z_1^{m_1} z_2^{m_2}) t^d$$

(in the right hand side we identified $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^{\delta_i}$ to a subring of $\mathbb{C}[x, y, t]$ via the isomorphism of (1)). Corollary 2.4 implies that $\tilde{\pi}_i$ is surjective, and therefore $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^{\delta_i}$ is finitely generated over $\mathbb{C}$, as required. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. Let $\delta := \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. Then $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^\delta$ is not finitely generated.

Proof. Let u, v, ξ be indeterminates and η be the degree-like function on $\mathbb{C}[u, v]$ defined as follows:

$$\eta(f(u, v)) = 2 \deg_u \left(f(u, v)|_{v=u^{5/2}+u^{-1}+\xi u^{-3/2}} \right).$$

In the terminology of [Mon13, Section 3.2], $u^{5/2} + u^{-1} + \xi u^{-3/2}$ is the *generic degree-wise Puiseux series* corresponding to η . Now consider the map $\mathbb{C}[u, v] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ given by $u \mapsto x^2$ and $v \mapsto y$. It is not hard to check that each δ_i is an *extension* of η , i.e. δ_i restricts to η on $\mathbb{C}(u, v)$. Note that $-\eta$ is a *discrete valuation* on $\mathbb{C}[u, v]$. Since the degree of the extension $\mathbb{C}(x, y)$ over $\mathbb{C}(u, v)$ is 2, it follows from [ZS75, Theorem VI.19] that δ_1 and δ_2 are in fact the *only* extensions of η to $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$. It follows from Lemma A.3 that $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^\delta$ is the integral closure of $\mathbb{C}[u, v]^\eta$ in $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$.

Using [Mon13, Algorithm 3.24], it is straightforward to compute that the *key forms* of η [Mon13, Definition 3.17] are $u, v, v^2 - u^5, v^2 - u^5 - 2u^{-1}v$. In particular, the last key form of η is *not* a polynomial. It follows from [Mon13, Theorem 1.8] that the compactification of $\mathbb{C}^2$ determined by η is *not* projective, and therefore $\mathbb{C}[u, v]^\eta$ is *not* finitely generated over $\mathbb{C}$ (due to [Mon10a, Proposition 2.5]). [AM69, Proposition 7.8] then shows that $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^\delta$ is also not finitely generated over $\mathbb{C}$, as required. $\square$

Remark 2.7. Let p be any odd integer ≥ 3 and $f(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}]$ be such that

1. $f(x) = \sum_{i=-p+1}^p a_i x^i$,
2. $a_p \neq 0$, and
3. $a_{-q} \neq 0$ for some q such that $2 \leq q \leq p-1$.

Let $q := -\text{ord}_x(f(x))$. Then $q \geq 2$ by assumption 3. Pick any pair of positive integers ω_1, ω_2 such that $q < \omega_2/\omega_1 < p$. Let $f_1(x) := f(x)$ and $f_2(x) := \sum_{i=-p+1}^p (-1)^i a_i x^i$. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, let $y_i := y - f_i(x)$ and δ_i be the (restriction to $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$) of the weighted degree on $\mathbb{C}(x, y) = \mathbb{C}(x, y_i)$ corresponding to weights ω_1 for x and $-\omega_2$ for y_i . Let $\delta := \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. Then it follows by similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 that each $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^{\delta_i}$ is finitely generated as an algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, but $\mathbb{C}[x, y]^\delta$ is *not*. (Note that Theorem 2.1 corresponds to the case that $p = 5$, $f(x) = x^5 + x^{-2}$, and $(\omega_1, \omega_2) = (1, 3)$.)

3 A partial result for $n = 2$

Theorem 3.1. *Let R_1, R_2 be finitely generated k -subalgebras of $k[x_1, x_2]$. Assume that for each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, R_i is integrally closed and the field of fractions of R_i is $k(x_1, x_2)$. Then $R_1 \cap R_2$ is also finitely generated as an algebra over k .*

Proof. W.l.o.g. we may assume that k is algebraically closed. By [Sch00, Corollary 6.3] it suffices to show that there is a normal surface U over k such that $R_1 \cap R_2 = \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_U)$. We now construct a U as in the preceding sentence. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, let $X_i := \text{Spec } R_i$ and $\bar{X}_i$ be a projective compactification of X_i . Let $\bar{X}$ be the closure in $\bar{X}_1 \times \bar{X}_2$ of the graph of the birational correspondence $X_1 \dashrightarrow X_2$ induced by the identification of their function field and let $\tilde{X}$ be the normalization of $\bar{X}$. For each i , let $\pi_i : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \bar{X}_i$ be the natural projection and $U_i := \pi_i^{-1}(X_i)$. Then $R_i = \Gamma(U_i, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}})$ for each i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Setting $U := U_1 \cup U_2$, it follows that $R_1 \cap R_2 = \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_U)$, as required. $\square$

A A technical lemma

Definition A.1. A degree-like function δ on a k -algebra A is called a *semidegree* if δ satisfies condition P2 always with an *equality*. We say that δ is a *subdegree* if there are finitely many semidegrees $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k$ such that

$$\delta(f) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \delta_j(f) \quad \text{for all } f \in A \setminus \{0\}. \quad (5)$$

Remark A.2. If δ is integer-valued on $A \setminus \{0\}$ (i.e. $\delta(f) = -\infty$ iff $f = 0$), then δ is a semidegree iff $-\delta$ is a *discrete valuation*.

Let $A \subseteq B$ be k -algebras which are also integral domains. Assume B is integral over A and the quotient field L of B is a finite separable extension of the quotient field K of A .

Lemma A.3. *Let $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m$ be semidegrees on A which are integer-valued on $A \setminus \{0\}$, and $\delta := \max\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\}$. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, let η_{ij} , $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, be the extension of δ_i to B . Define $\eta := \max\{\eta_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq m_i\}$. If A is integrally closed, then B^η is integral over A^δ . If in addition B is integrally closed, then B^η is the integral closure of A^δ in L .*

Proof. By construction, the restriction of η to A is precisely δ , so that $A^\delta \subseteq B^\eta$. Since if B is integrally closed, then B^η is also integrally closed [Mon10b, Proposition 2.2.7], the last assertion of the lemma follows from the first. To demonstrate the first assertion, let $f \in B \setminus \{0\}$ and $d' := \eta(f)$. We show that $(f)_{d'}$ satisfies an integral equation over A^δ . Let the *minimal polynomial* of f over K be

$$P(t) := t^d + \sum_e g_e t^{d-e} \quad (6)$$

and L' be the Galois closure of L over K . Since L' is Galois over K , it contains all the roots $f_1, \dots, f_d$ of $P(t)$. Since L/K is finite and separable, each $f_i = \sigma_i(f)$ for some $\sigma_i \in \text{Gal}(L'/K)$. For each i, j , $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, let $\{\eta'_{ijk} : 1 \leq k \leq l_{ij}\}$ be the extensions of η_{ij} to L' . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'_i &:= \max\{\eta'_{ijk} : 1 \leq j \leq m_i, 1 \leq k \leq l_{ij}\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \text{ and} \\ \eta' &:= \max\{\eta'_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the δ_i , η_{ij} and η'_{ijk} 's are negative of discrete valuations, it follows that each $\eta'_{ijk} = \eta'_{i11} \circ \sigma_{ijk}$ for some $\sigma_{ijk} \in \text{Gal}(L'/K)$ [ZS75, Theorem VI.12, Corollary 3]. It follows that for all i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta'_i(f_j) &= \max\{\eta'_{i11} \circ (\sigma_{ij'k'} \circ \sigma_j)(f) : 1 \leq j' \leq m_i, 1 \leq k' \leq l_{ij}\} \\ &= \max\{\eta'_{ij''k''}(f) : 1 \leq j'' \leq m_i, 1 \leq k'' \leq l_{ij}\} \\ &= \eta'_i(f).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\eta'_i|_K = \delta_i$ for each i . Since each g_e (from (6)) is an e -th symmetric polynomial in $f_1, \dots, f_d$, it follows that for all i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, and all e , $1 \leq e \leq d$,

$$\delta_i(g_e) = \eta'_i(g_e) \leq e\eta'_i(f). \quad (7)$$

Since $\eta'|_B = \eta$, it follows that $d' := \eta(f) = \eta'(f)$. By definition of η' , there exists i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that $d' = \eta'_i(f) \geq \eta'_{i'}(f)$ for all i' , $1 \leq i' \leq m$. It then follows from (7) that

$$\delta_i(g_e) \leq ed' \quad \text{for all } i, 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (8)$$

Now recall that A is integrally closed, so that $g_e \in A$ for all e [AM69, Proposition 5.15]. Since inequality (8) implies that $\delta(g_e) \leq ed'$, it follows that $(g_e)_{ed'} \in A^\delta$ for all e . Consequently $(f)_{d'}$ satisfies the integral equation

$$\tilde{P}(T) := T^d + \sum_e (g_e)_{ed'} T^{d-e}$$

over A^δ . Therefore B^η is integral over A^δ , as required. $\square$

References

- [AM69] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald. *Introduction to commutative algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1969.
- [Bay02] Thomas Bayer. On the intersection of invariant rings. *Beiträge Algebra Geom.*, 43(2):551–555, 2002.
- [DO08] Amartya K. Dutta and Nobuharu Onoda. On finite generation of R -subalgebras of $R[X]$. *J. Algebra*, 320(1):57–80, 2008.
- [Eak72] Paul Eakin. A note on finite dimensional subrings of polynomial rings. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 31:75–80, 1972.
- [Gal57] David Gale. Subalgebras of an algebra with a single generator are finitely generated. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 8:929–930, 1957.
- [GH85] Robert Gilmer and William Heinzer. Finitely generated intermediate rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 37(3):237–264, 1985.
- [Mon10a] Pinaki Mondal. Projective completions of affine varieties via degree-like functions. arXiv:1012.0835 [Math.AG], 2010.

- [Mon10b] Pinaki Mondal. Towards a Bezout-type theory of affine varieties. <http://hdl.handle.net/1807/24371>, March 2010. PhD Thesis.
- [Mon13] Pinaki Mondal. An effective criterion for algebraic contractibility of rational curves. arXiv: 1301.0126, 2013.
- [Nag66] Masayoshi Nagata. A theorem on finite generation of a ring. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 27:193–205, 1966.
- [Sch00] Stefan Schröer. On contractible curves on normal surfaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 524:1–15, 2000.
- [ZS75] Oscar Zariski and Pierre Samuel. *Commutative algebra. Vol. II*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975. Reprint of the 1960 edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 29.